



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*ccw*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,626	01/22/2004	Meng-An Pan	58268.00346	3538
32294	7590	09/06/2007	EXAMINER	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.			AGHDAM, FRESHTEH N	
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT			2611	
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/761,626	PAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Freshteh N. Aghdam	2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

Examiner of record has changed to Freshteh N Aghdam. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pikkarainen et al (US 5,701,106).

As to claims 1 and 10, Pikkaraninen discloses a method of and/ or apparatus for modulating digital signal to higher frequency analog signal comprising: performing delta sigma modulation on a digital baseband quadrature signal (Fig. 8, block 91); converting the modulated signal to an analog signal (block 92); converting the analog signal to an RF signal (Abstract); and inherently transmitting the RF signal.

As to claim 2, Pikkaraninen further discloses that the modulation reduces the number of bits of the digital quadrature signal (Col. 5, lines 54-63).

As to claim 8, Pikkarainen discloses performing interpolation filtering on the digital quadrature signal before the delta sigma modulation (block 90).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkarainen et al, and further in view of Lipka (US 7,227,910).

As to claim 3, Pikkarainen discloses that the reduction is from n-bits to 1 bit. Pikkarainen is silent about the reduction is from 10 bits to 4 bits. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such limitation is merely a matter of design requirement and it would have been obvious in the system of Pikkarainen reduction of the number of bits from 10 bits to 4 bits because using a digital to analog converter with a higher bit width makes it possible to use a lower oversampling factor, which has a positive effect on the power consumption and depending on what the limit is for power consumption in that particular design the bit width could vary as it is evidenced by Lipka (Col. 2, lines 45-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reduce the number of bits from 10 to 4 for the reason stated above.

As to claim 4, Pikkarainen is not explicit about amplifying the RF signal prior to transmission. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is well

known in the art to amplify the signal prior to transmission as it is evidenced by Lipka (Fig. 1, block 13) in order to adjust the signal gain prior to transmission as consequently improving the communication system performance.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkarainen et al.

As to claim 5, Pikkarainen discloses that the sigma delta modulation includes 1<sup>st</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> order delta sigma modulation (Col. 5, lines 27-31). Pikkarainen is silent about the sigma delta modulation includes 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulation. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a limitation is merely a matter of design choice and would have been obvious in the system of Pikkarainen because the higher the order of the delta sigma modulator the less the quantization noise (i.e. the higher the signal to noise ratio). Therefore, using a 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulator and not for instance a 1<sup>st</sup> order delta sigma modulator will result in higher signal to noise ratio. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulator for the reason stated above.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkarainen et al, and further in view of Hossack (US 6,819,276).

As to claim 6, Pikkarainen discloses all the subject matter claimed in claim 1, except for coding the modulated signal with a thermometer code. Hossack discloses a digital to analog converter that performs coding the modulated signal with a

thermometer code (Fig. 3, block 120). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to code the modulated signal of Pikkarainen with a thermometer code as Hossack discloses in order to reduce the number of bits that are in error.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkaraninen et al, and further in view of Norsworthy et al (US 5,512,898).

As to claim 7, Pikkarainen discloses modulating the quadrature signal using one of frequency shift keying and phase shift keying (Col. 2, lines 1-12). Pikkarainen is not explicit about modulating the quadrature signal prior to performing delta sigma modulation. Norsworthy discloses modulating the quadrature signal using one of the frequency shift keying or phase shift keying modulations prior to delta sigma modulation in order to highly efficiently transferring data by utilizing an I/Q modulation technique (Fig. 2, blocks 130 and 150; Col. 6, lines 7-11; Col. 10, lines 4-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform I/Q modulation prior to delta sigma modulation for the reason stated above.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkaraninen et al, and further in view of Fujimori (US 6,236,912).

As to claim 9, Pikkarainen discloses all the subject matter claimed in claim 8, except for the interpolation filtering reduces the digital quadrature signal from 12 bits to 10 bits. Fujimori discloses that the interpolation filtering is capable of reducing the bit width by the interpolation rate change switch within the interpolation filter (Col. 6, lines

45-52). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the exact value the bit width is a design requirement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to output a reduced the bit width signal by the interpolation filter of Pikkaraninen as taught by Fujimori in order to reduce the hardware complexity of the device/ circuitry.

Claims 11-12, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkaraninen et al.

As to claim 11, Pikkaraninen discloses a method of and/ or apparatus for modulating digital signal to higher frequency analog signal comprising: performing delta sigma modulation on a digital baseband quadrature signal (Fig. 8, block 91); converting the modulated signal to an analog signal (block 92); converting the analog signal to an RF signal (Abstract); and inherently transmitting the RF signal. Pikkaraninen is not explicit about using a mixer to up convert the analog signal to the RF signal. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is well known in the art to up utilize a mixer in order to up convert the intermediate signal to the RF signal to transmit the signal through radio frequency medium. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a mixer to up convert the signal to the RF signal for the reason stated above.

As to claim 12, Pikkaraninen further discloses that the modulation reduces the number of bits of the digital quadrature signal (Col. 5, lines 54-63).

As to claim 15, Pikkaraninen discloses that the sigma delta modulation includes 1<sup>st</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> order delta sigma modulation (Col. 5, lines 27-31). Pikkaraninen is silent about the

Art Unit: 2611

sigma delta modulation includes 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulation. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such a limitation is merely a matter of design choice and would have been obvious in the system of Pikkarainen because the higher the order of the delta sigma modulator the less the quantization noise (i.e. the higher the signal to noise ratio). Therefore, using a 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulator and not for instance a 1<sup>st</sup> order delta sigma modulator will result in higher signal to noise ratio. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a 2<sup>nd</sup> order delta sigma modulator for the reason stated above.

As to claim 18, Pikkarainen further discloses performing interpolation filtering on the digital quadrature signal before the delta sigma modulation (block 90).

Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkarainen et al, and further in view of Lipka (US 7,227,910).

As to claim 13, Pikkarainen discloses that the reduction is from n-bits to 1 bit. Pikkarainen is silent about the reduction is from 10 bits to 4 bits. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such limitation is merely a matter of design requirement and it would have been obvious in the system of Pikkarainen reduction of the number of bits from 10 bits to 4 bits because using a digital to analog converter with a higher bit width makes it possible to use a lower oversampling factor, which has a positive effect on the power consumption and depending on what the limit is for power consumption in that particular design the bit width could vary as it is evidenced by Lipka

(Col. 2, lines 45-53). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to reduce the number of bits from 10 to 4 for the reason stated above.

As to claim 14, Pikkarainen is not explicit about amplifying the RF signal prior to transmission. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is well known in the art to amplify the signal prior to transmission as it is evidenced by Lipka (Fig. 1, block 13) in order to adjust the signal gain prior to transmission as consequently improving the communication system performance.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkaraninen et al, and further in view of Norsworthy et al (US 5,512,898).

As to claim 17, Pikkarainen discloses modulating the quadrature signal using one of frequency shift keying and phase shift keying (Col. 2, lines 1-12). Pikkarainen is not explicit about modulating the quadrature signal prior to performing delta sigma modulation. Norsworthy discloses modulating the quadrature signal using one of the frequency shift keying or phase shift keying modulations prior to delta sigma modulation in order to highly efficiently transferring data by utilizing an I/Q modulation technique (Fig. 2, blocks 130 and 150; Col. 6, lines 7-11; Col. 10, lines 4-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to perform I/Q modulation prior to delta sigma modulation for the reason stated above.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pikkaraninen et al, and further in view of Fujimori (US 6,236,912).

As to claim 19, Pikkarainen discloses all the subject matter claimed in claim 18, except for the interpolation filtering reduces the digital quadrature signal from 12 bits to 10 bits. Fujimori discloses that the interpolation filtering is capable of reducing the bit width by the interpolation rate change switch within the interpolation filter (Col. 6, lines 45-52). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the exact value the bit width is a design requirement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to output a reduced the bit width signal by the interpolation filter of Pikkaraninen as taught by Fujimori in order to reduce the hardware complexity of the device/ circuitry.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Freshteh N. Aghdam whose telephone number is 571-272-6037. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on 571-272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Freshteh Aghdam  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2611

FA  
August 30, 2007



CHIEH M. FAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER